



2164
Serial No. 09/368,996
Att. Docket No. 2-604.2-1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor: Barber, Timothy P.
Serial No.: 09/368,996
Filed: August 5, 1999

Title: Method for Billing for Services Delivered Over a
Computer Network

Group Art Unit: 2164
Examiner: S. Wasylchak

RESPONSE TO PAPER NO. 8 (OFFICE ACTION MAILED FEB. 11, 2003)

Box Non-Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

RECEIVED

MAY 15 2003


GROUP 3600

Applicant provides as the response to the Office action mailed Feb. 11, 2003 this communication, in which no changes are made to the claims and no argument is made regarding the outstanding rejections, in view of a telephone interview summary (copy attached) transmitted to applicant's attorney by facsimile on May 7, 2003, stating that a new Office action is required since the Office action mailed Feb. 11, 2003 (the third Office action) is inconsistent with that mailed Sept. 5, 2002 (the second Office action).

Date

May 7, 2003


Respectfully submitted,


James A. Retter

Registration No. 41,266
Patent Agent for the Applicant

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224
tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited today with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.


Jodie L. Droniak

Date:

May 7, 2003



Interview Summary

Application No.

09/368,996

Applicant(s)

BARBER, TIMOTHY P.

Examiner

Steven R. Wasylchak

Art Unit

3624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Steven R. Wasylchak.(3) Atty. Jim Retter.(2) Primary Hani Kazimi.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 March 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: NONE.Identification of prior art discussed: Toader(US 5,774,869), Usui(US 5,956,697) and Egendorf(US 5,794,221).Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Separate office actions by Exr. Daniel Felton and Exr. Steven Wasylchak were apparently inconsistent and a new office action is required.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

RECEIVED
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON

MAY - 7 2003

FILE 2-604.2-1
ANS'D. [Signature]

[Signature: Steven Wasylchak]
Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.